

## REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present application in view of the following remarks. Claims 1-16 are currently pending in the application, of which claims 1, 8, 9, and 16 are independent. In the Office Action dated January 22, 2008, the Examiner objected to the disclosure for lacking information on the related applications. The Examiner also rejected pending claims 1-16 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 7,000,187 ("*Messinger*") in view of U.S. Publication No. 2003/0189597 A1 ("*Anderson*").

In response, Applicants have amended the specification to provide application numbers of related applications and amended independent claims 1, 8, 9, and 16. No new subject matter has been added. Support for the amendments to the claims may be found, for example, at pages 25, paragraphs [097] to [100]. Applicants respectfully submit that amended independent claims 1, 8, 9, and 16 and dependent claims 2-7 and 10-15 are not obvious under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over the combination of *Messinger* and *Anderson*.

More specifically, amended independent claim 1 recites, among other things, "displaying the first work pane having a first user interface pattern associated with a first of the two or more sequential steps of the task and the second work pane having a second user interface pattern associated with a second of the two or more sequential steps of the task simultaneously in the same window, wherein content of both the first work pane and the second work pane is automatically changed based on the two or more sequential steps of the task being performed." In rejecting claim 1, the Examiner conceded that *Messinger* does not show or suggest this feature because "screen 40b

and 40c when made to correspond to sequential steps associated with a task . . . are nonetheless never displayed simultaneously in the same window as mentioned above.” Rather, screen 40c replaces screen 40b in the window when the user completes step 1 of the task and moves on to step 2. Office Action, page 5. The Examiner, instead, relied on *Anderson* to show the above feature. In particular, the Examiner referred to virtual desktops 320-326 in a preview window 310 in FIG. 6 of *Anderson* as illustrating “two different set of panes/windows to be displayed simultaneously in the same window.” Office Action, page 5.

Contrary to the Examiner’s contention, Applicants submit that the combination of *Messinger* and *Anderson* fails to show or suggest the amended independent claim 1. Specifically, amended claim 1 requires not only “displaying the first work pane having a first user interface pattern associated with a first of the two or more sequential steps of the task and the second work pane having a second user interface pattern associated with a second of the two or more sequential steps of the task simultaneously in the same window,” but also that “content of both the first work pane and the second work pane is automatically changed based on the two or more sequential steps of the task being performed.” Referenced items 320-326 of *Anderson* are merely scaled virtual desktops containing application windows 342B- 348B that are “shown as shadows . . . [where each shadow is] an imperfect or faint representation of an actual representation of an application window. Because each of these application windows 342B-348B is active in a particular virtual desktop [320-326], none of them is shown to be active in more than one virtual desktop.” *Anderson*’s Disclosure, paragraph [0037]. Therefore, *Anderson*’s virtual desktops 320-326 are discrete platforms for running unrelated

application windows 342B-348B, and are simply displayed in “the preview window 310” to allow “a user to apprehend macroscopically all the virtual desktops at once as well as where he may have placed various application windows without visiting each of the virtual desktops.” *Anderson's* Disclosure, paragraph [0037].

In view of the above, *Anderson* at least fails to show or suggest simultaneously displaying in the same window related work panes corresponding to sequential steps of a single task where “the first work pane having a first user interface pattern associated with a first of the two or more sequential steps of the task and the second work pane having a second user interface pattern associated with a second of the two or more sequential steps of the task,” as recited in amended claim 1. Additionally, because *Anderson's* virtual desktops 320-326 are discrete and unrelated to each other, *Anderson* also fails to show or suggest that “content of both the first work pane and the second work pane is automatically changed based on the two or more sequential steps of the task being performed,” as recited in amended claim 1.

Accordingly, at least because *Anderson* fails to show or suggest the above feature of amended claim 1, which, as conceded by the Examiner is also not shown or suggested by *Messinger*, the combination of *Messinger* and *Anderson* fails to render obvious every feature of amended claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Amended independent claims 8, 9, and 16 each recite features that are similar to those discussed above in connection with claim 1 and are, therefore, also not rendered obvious by the combination of *Messinger* and *Anderson* for at least the reasons stated above. Dependent claims 2-7 and 10-15 depend from claims 1 and 9, respectively, and are additionally allowable at least because of their dependency on allowable base claims.

In view of the above, Applicants submit that pending claims 1-16 are in condition for allowance and respectfully request prompt reconsideration by the Examiner.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our Deposit Account 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,  
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: March 27, 2008

By: 

Cathy C. Ding  
Reg. No. 52,820